arXiv:1603.03362v2 [math.PR] 22 Mar 2016

ON BOUNDED-TYPE THIN LOCAL SETS OF THE TWO-DIMENSIONAL GAUSSIAN FREE FIELD

JUHAN ARU, AVELIO SEPÚLVEDA, WENDELIN WERNER

Abstract. We study a certain class of local sets of the two-dimensional Gaussian free field (GFF) in a simply-connected domain, and their relation to the conformal loop ensemble CLE_4 and its variants. More specifically, we consider bounded type thin local sets (BTLS), where thin means that the local set is small in size, and bounded-type means that the harmonic function describing the mean value of the field away from the local set is bounded by some deterministic constant. We show that a local set is a BTLS if and only if it is contained in some nested version of the CLE_4 carpet, and prove that all BTLS are necessarily connected to the boundary of the domain. We also construct all possible BTLS for which the corresponding harmonic function takes only two prescribed values and show that all these sets are in fact measurable functions of the GFF.

1. Introduction

1.1. **General introduction.** Thanks to the recent works of Schramm, Sheffield, Dubédat, Miller (see [26, 5, 30, 12, 13, 14, 15] and the references therein), we know that many structures built using Schramm's SLE curves can be naturally coupled with the planar Gaussian Free Field (GFF). For instance, even though the GFF is not a continuous function, SLE_4 and the conformal loop ensemble CLE_4 can be viewed as "level lines" of the GFF. In these couplings, the notion of *local sets of the GFF* and their properties turn out to be instrumental. This general abstract concept appears already in the study of Markov random field in the 70s and 80s (see in particular [23]) and can be viewed as the natural generalization of stopping times for multidimensional time. More precisely, a random set A coupled with a (zero-boundary) GFF in a planar domain D is said to be a local set for this GFF, if the conditional distribution of the GFF in $D \setminus A$ given A has the law of the sum of a (conditionally) independent GFF Γ^A in $D \setminus A$ with a random harmonic function h_A defined in $D \setminus A$. This harmonic function can be interpreted as the harmonic extension to $D \setminus A$ of the values of the GFF on ∂A.

In the present paper, we are interested in a special type of local sets that we call *bounded type thin local sets* (or BTLS). Our definition of BTLS imposes three type of conditions, on top of being local sets:

(1) There exists a constant K such that almost surely, $|h_A| \leq K$ in the complement of A.
(2) The set A is a thin local set in the sense defined in [28, 33]. This means that the harmonic function h_A carries itself also all the information about the GFF also on A, in the sense that for any smooth test function f, the random variable (Γ, f) is almost surely equal to $(\int_{D\setminus A} h_A(x)f(x)dx) + \Gamma^A(f)$.
(3) Almost surely, each connected component of A that does not intersect ∂D has a neighborhood that does intersect no other connected component of A.

If the set A is a BTLS with the constant K in the first condition, we say that it is a K-BTLS.

The first two conditions are the most important ones. The first condition is of course highly non-trivial. Notice that a deterministic non-polar set is not a BTLS because the corresponding harmonic function is not bounded, so that a non-empty BTLS is necessarily random. As we shall see, the second condition can be understood as a condition on the size of the set A (it can not be

too large) and can be compared in the previous analogy between local sets and stopping times to requiring stopping times to be uniformly integrable.

The third condition implies in particular that A has only countably many connected components that do not intersect ∂D. This is somewhat restrictive as there exist totally disconnected sets Cantor sets A that are non-polar for the Brownian motion (for instance a Cantor set with Hausdorff dimension in $(0,1)$), and can therefore have a non-negligible boundary effect for the GFF. We however believe that this third condition is not essential and could be disposed of (ie. all statements would still hold without this condition), and we comment on this at the end of the paper.

We remark that the precise choice of definitions is not that important here. We see, in fact, that the combination of these three conditions implies stronger statements. For instance, the (upper) Minkowski dimension of such a K-BTLS A is necessarily bounded by some constant $d(K)$ that is smaller than 2 (and this implies the second condition), and that $\partial D \cup A$ has almost surely only one connected component (which implies the third condition).

Non-trivial BTLS do exist, and the main examples are provided by SLE_4, CLE_4 and their variants (for their natural coupling with the GFF) as shown in [5, 11, 26]. In this paper, among other things, we prove that any BTLS A is contained in a nested version of CLE_4 and that $A \cup \partial D$ is necessarily connected. From our proofs it also follows that the CLE_4 and its various generalizations are deterministic functions of the GFF. Keeping the stopping time analogy in mind, one can compare these results with the following feature of one-dimensional Brownian motion B started from the origin: if T is a stopping time with respect to the filtration of B such $|B_T| \leq K$ almost surely, then either $T \leq \inf\{t > 0 \ : \ |B_T| = K\}$ almost surely, or T is not uniformly integrable. In other words, the CLE_4 and its nested versions and variants are the field analogues of one-dimensional exit times of intervals.

One important general property of local sets, shown in [26] and used extensively in [12], is that when A and B are two local sets coupled with the same GFF, in such a way that A and B are conditionally independent given the GFF, then their union $A \cup B$ is also a local set. It seems quite natural to expect that it should be possible to describe the harmonic function $h_{A\cup B}$ simply in terms of h_A and h_B, but deriving a general result in this direction appears to be, somewhat surprisingly, tricky. The present approach provides a way to obtain results in this direction in the case of BTLS: we shall see that the union of two BTLSs is always a BTLS.

We plan to generalize in [3] some features of our approach to the imaginary geometry setting, and hope that this might be of some help to enlighten some of the technical issues dealt with in [12, 13, 14].

1.2. **An overview of results.** We now state more precisely some of the results that we shall derive. All of the results we state in this section hold for a simply connected domain D.

Let us first briefly recall some features of the coupling between CLE_4 and GFF in such a domain. Using a branching-tree variant of SLE_4 introduced by Sheffield in [29], it is possible to define a certain random conformally invariant family of marked open sets (O_j, ϵ_j), where the O_j's form a disjoint family of open subsets of the upper half-plane, and the marks ϵ_j belong to $\{-1, 1\}$. The complement A of $\cup_j O_j$ is called a CLE_4 carpet (see Figure 1) and its Minkowski dimension is in fact almost surely equal to $15/8$ (see [19, 27]). As pointed out by Miller and Sheffield [11], the set A can be coupled with the GFF as a BTLS in a way that h_A is constant and equal to $2\lambda\epsilon_j$ in each O_j.

By the property of local sets, conditionally on A, the field $\Gamma - h_A$ consists of independent Gaussian free fields Γ^j inside each O_j. We can then iterate the same construction independently for each of these GFFs Γ^j, using a CLE_4 in each O_j. In this way, for each given $z \in \mathbb{H}$, if we define $O^1(z)$ to be the open set O_j that contains z (for each fixed z, this set almost surely exists) and set $\epsilon^1(z) = \epsilon_j$, we then get a second set $O^2(z) \subset O^1(z)$ corresponding to the nested CLE_4 in $O^1(z)$ and a new mark



Simulation by David B. Wilson.

FIGURE 1. The set in black represents the CLE_4 carpet and the white holes are the open sets O_j.

$\epsilon^2(z)$. Iterating the procedure, we obtain for each given z, an almost surely decreasing sequence of open sets $O^n(z)$ and a sequence of marks $\epsilon^n(z)$ in $\{-1,+1\}$. When $z' \in O^n(z)$, then $O^n(z') = O^n(z)$ and $\epsilon^n(z') = \epsilon^n(z)$, so that $\epsilon^n(\cdot)$ can be viewed as a constant function in $O^n(z)$. Furthermore, for each $z \in D$, the sequence $\Upsilon_n(z) = \sum_{m=1}^n \epsilon^m(z)$ is a simple random walk.

For each n, the complement A_n of the union of all $O^n(z)$ with $z \in \mathbb{Q}^2 \cap D$ is then a BTLS and the corresponding harmonic function h_n is just $2\lambda\Upsilon_n(\cdot)$. The set A_n is called the nested CLE_4 of level n (we refer to it as $\mathrm{CLE}_{4,n}$ in the sequel). It is in fact easy to see that one can recover the GFF Γ from the knowledge of all these (A_n, h_n) for $n \geq 1$ (because for each smooth test function f, the sequence $(\Gamma - h_n)(f)$ converges to 0 in L^2).

For each integer $M \geq 1$, one can then define for each z in $\mathbb{H}$, the random variable $M(z)$ to be the smallest m at which $|\Upsilon_m(z)| = M$. As for each fixed z, the sequence $(\Upsilon_n(z))$ is just a simple random walk, $M(z)$ is almost surely finite. The complement A^M of the union of all these $O^{M(z)}(z)$ for z with rational coordinates defines a $2\lambda M$-BTLS: Indeed, the corresponding harmonic function is then constant in each connected component $O^{M(z)}(z)$ and takes values in $\{2M\lambda, -2M\lambda\}$, and we explain in Section 4) that the Minkowski dimension of A^M is almost surely bounded by $d = 2 - (1/(8M^2)) < 2$ which imply the thinness. We refer to this set A^M as a CLE_4^M (mind that M is in superscript, as opposed to $\mathrm{CLE}_{4,m}$, where we just iterated m times the CLE_4).

A special case of our results is that this CLE_4^M is the only BTLS with harmonic function taking its values in $\{-2M\lambda, 2M\lambda\}$. More precisely:

Proposition 1. *Suppose that A is a BTLS coupled to the same GFF as a CLE_4^M, and such that the corresponding harmonic function h_A takes values in $\{-2M\lambda, 2M\lambda\}$. Then, A is almost surely equal to the CLE_4^M.*

In particular, for $M = 1$ and taking A to be another CLE_4 coupled with the same GFF, this means that any two CLE_4 that are coupled with the same GFF as local sets are almost surely identical. This BTLS approach therefore provides a rather short proof of the fact the first layer

CLE_4 and all nested $\mathrm{CLE}_{4,m}$ are deterministic functions of the GFF (hence, that the information provided by the collection of nested labelled $\mathrm{CLE}_{4,m}$'s is equivalent to the information provided by the GFF itself). This fact is not new and is due to Miller and Sheffield [11], who have outlined the proof in private discussions, presentations and talks (and a paper in preparation). Our proof follows a slightly different strategy than the one proposed by Miller and Sheffield, with a different angle, although the basic ingredients are very similar (absolute continuity properties of the GFF, basic properties of local sets and the fact that SLE_4 itself is a deterministic function of the GFF).

Let us stress that here and in subsequent propositions, the condition of being thin is necessary. Indeed, if we consider the union of a CLE_4 with, say, the component of its complement that contains the the origin, we still obtain a local set for which the corresponding harmonic function is in $\{-2M\lambda, 2M\lambda\}$, yet it is almost surely clearly not contained in any of the CLE_4^M.

We also characterize all possible BTLS such that the harmonic function can take only two possible prescribed values, and study their properties:

Proposition 2. *Let us consider $-a < 0 < b$.*

(1) When $a + b < 2\lambda$, it is not possible to construct a BTLS A with $h_A \in \{-a, b\}$.

(2) When $a + b \geq 2\lambda$, it is possible to construct a BTLS $A_{-a,b}$ coupled with a GFF Γ in such a way that $h_A \in \{-a, b\}$. Moreover, the sets $A_{-a,b}$ are

- *Unique in the sense that if A' is another BTLS coupled with the same Γ, such that for all $z \in D$, $h_{A'}(z) \in \{-a, b\}$ almost surely, then $A' = A_{-a,b}$ almost surely.*
- *Measurable functions of the GFF Γ that they are coupled with.*
- *Monotonic in the following sense: if $[a, b] \subset [a', b']$ and $-a < 0 < b$ with $b + a \geq 2\lambda$, then almost surely, $A_{-a,b} \subset A_{-a',b'}$.*

Further information about the sets $A_{-a,b}$ and their properties (detailed construction, dimensions) as well as some generalizations are discussed in Section 6.

Another type of result that we derive using similar ideas as in the proof of Proposition 1 goes as follows:

Proposition 3. *If A is a $(2M\lambda)$-BTLS associated to the GFF Γ, A is almost surely a subset of the CLE_4^{M+1} associated to Γ.*

Notice that one would expect to conclude that $A \subseteq \mathrm{CLE}_4^M$ in the proposition (and this would mean that CLE_4^M is maximal among all $2\lambda M$-BTLS), but this seems to require some more technical work that we do not discuss in the present paper. As an immediate consequence, we see that the finite union of BTLS is almost surely contained in some CLE_4^M for some given M, and that it is again a BTLS. This type of facts helps to derive the above-mentioned fact:

Proposition 4. *If A is a BTLS, then $A \cup \partial D$ is connected.*

The structure of the paper is the following: We first recall some basic features about BTLS. Then, we consider generalized level lines of the GFF and discuss a useful result about their boundary hitting behaviour. Thereafter, we recall features of the construction of the coupling of the GFF with CLE_4^M. This sets the stage for the proofs of the propositions involving CLE_4^M. We then finally turn to Proposition 2 and the discussion about the dimension of the sets $A_{-a,b}$.

2. Local sets and BTLS

In this section, we quickly browse through basic definitions and properties of the GFF and of bounded-type local sets. We only discuss items that are directly used in the current paper. For a more general discussion of local sets, thin local sets (not necessarily of bounded type), we refer to [28, 33].

Throughout this paper, the set D denotes an open planar domain with a non-empty and non-polar boundary. By conformal invariance, we can always assume that D is a subset of the unit disc $\mathbb{D}$. The most general case that we work with are domains D such that the complement of D has at most countably many connected components with only finitely many components in each compact set and no complement being a singleton (this is a non-trivial condition as it excludes for instance sets like $\mathbb{D} \setminus K$, where $K \subset [0,1]$ is the middle Cantor set). Recall that by a theorem of He and Schramm [9], such domains D are known to be conformally equivalent to a circle domain (i.e. to $\mathbb{D} \setminus K$, where K is a union of closed disjoint discs).

Recall that the (zero boundary) Gaussian Free Field (GFF) in a domain D can be viewed as a centered Gaussian process Γ (we also sometimes write Γ^D when we the domain needs to be specified) indexed by the set of continuous functions with compact support in D, with covariance given by

$$\mathbb{E}[(\Gamma, f)(\Gamma, g)] = \iint_{D\times D} f(x) G_D(x,y) g(y) dx dy$$

where G_D is the Green's function (with Dirichlet boundary conditions) in D, normalized such that $G_D(x,y) \sim (2\pi)^{-1} \log(1/|x-y|)$ as $x \to y$. For this choice of normalization of G (and therefore of the GFF), we set

$$\lambda = \sqrt{\pi/8}.$$

Sometimes, other normalizations are used in the literature: If $G_D(x,y) \sim c \log(1/|x-y|)$ as $x \to y$, then λ should be taken to be $(\pi/2) \times \sqrt{c}$. Note that it is in fact possible and useful to define the random variable $\Gamma(\mu)$ for any fixed Borel measure μ, provided the energy $\int \mu(dx)\mu(dy) G_D(x,y)$ is finite.

Similarly to Brownian motion, the GFF can be also viewed as the Gaussian measure associated to the Dirichlet space $\mathcal{H}_0^1$, which is the closure of the set of smooth functions of compact support in D with respect to the Dirichlet norm

$$(f,f)_\nabla = \iint_{D\times D} \nabla f(x) \nabla f(y) dx dy.$$

The Dirichlet space is also the Cameron-Martin space for the GFF; in particular the law of $\Gamma + F$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the law of Γ whenever $F \in \mathcal{H}_0^1$, and the Radon-Nikodym derivative is given by a constant multiple of $\exp((\Gamma, F)_\nabla)$, see e.g. [5, 30].

The covariance kernel of the GFF blows up on the diagonal, which makes it impossible to view Γ as a random function. It can, however, be shown that the GFF has a version that lives in some space of generalized functions, what justifies the notation (Γ, f) for Γ acting on functions f (see for example [5]). However, it is not possible to make sense of (Γ, f) when $f = 1_A$ is a the indicator function of an arbitrary random set A. Local sets form a class of random sets where this is (in a sense) possible:

Definition 5 (Local sets)**.** *Consider a random triple (Γ, A, Γ_A), where Γ is a GFF in D, A is a random relatively closed subset of D (i.e. $D \setminus A$ is open) and Γ_A a random distribution that can be viewed as a harmonic function when restricted to $D \setminus A$. We say that A is a local set for Γ if conditionally on A, $\Gamma - \Gamma_A$ is a GFF in $D \setminus A$.*

Notice that being a local set can also be seen as a property of the law of the couple (A, Γ), as one can recover Γ_A as the conditional expectation of Γ given A.

Let us list a few properties of local sets (see for instance [26] for derivations and further properties):

Lemma 6.

(1) Any local set can be coupled in a unique way with a given GFF: if two random triples (Γ, A, Γ_A) and (Γ, A, Γ'_A) are both local couplings, then Γ_A and Γ'_A are almost surely identical.

(2) When A and B are local sets coupled with the same GFF Γ, and that (A, Γ_A) and (B, Γ_B) are conditionally independent given Γ, then $A \cup B$ is also a local set coupled with Γ.

We now define local sets of bounded type:

Definition 7 (BTLS)**.** *Consider a random relatively closed subset A of D (i.e. so that $D \setminus A$ is open) and Γ a GFF defined on the same probability space. Let $K \in \mathbb{R}^+$, we say that A is a K-BTLS if the following four conditions are satisfied:*

(1) A is a local set of Γ.
(2) Almost surely, $|h_A| \leq K$ in $D \setminus A$.
(3) Almost surely, each connected component of A that does not intersect ∂D has a neighborhood that does intersect no other connected component of A.
(4) A is a thin local set in the sense defined in [28, 33]*: for any smooth test function $f \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty$, the random variable (Γ, f) is almost surely equal to $(\int_{D\setminus A} h_A(x) f(x) dx) + \Gamma^A(f)$.*

If A is a K-BTLS for some K, we say that it is a BTLS.

Note also that it is in fact possible to remove all isolated points from a BTLS (of which there are at most countably many because of the third property) without changing the property of being BTLS. Indeed, the bounded harmonic function h_A can be extended to those points and a GFF does not see polar sets. We therefore replace the third property by:

(3'): Almost surely, A contains no isolated points and each connected component of A that does not intersect ∂D has a neighborhood that does intersect no other connected component of A.

This reformulation will be handy to keep our statements simple.

It is not hard to see that in the case where the harmonic function is bounded, the condition of being thin given above is equivalent to saying that for the upper dyadic approximation $[A]_n$ of A, and for any smooth test function f, the sequence of random variables $(\Gamma, f\mathbf{1}_{[A]_n})$ converges in probability to 0. From a Borel-Cantelli argument, one can moreover see that this equivalent condition is implied by (see [28, 33]):

$(*)$**:** The expected volume of the ϵ-neighborhood of A decays like $o(1/\log(1/\epsilon))$ as $\epsilon \to 0$.

Note that if A and B are two BTLS that are coupled with the same GFF Γ, and that are conditionally independent given Γ, then we know by Lemma 6 that $A \cup B$ is a local set. Hence, in order to check that $A \cup B$ is a BTLS, we need to show it is thin and give an upper bound for the harmonic function $h_{A\cup B}$.

It is not hard to derive the following related fact:

Lemma 8. *Let A be a thin local set that satisfies the condition (3') of Definition 7, and let A' be a K-BTLS coupled with the same GFF in such a way that $A \subseteq A'$ almost surely. Then A is a K-BTLS.*

Proof. One just has to check that $|h_A| \leq K$. For any smooth ρ with compact support have that $\mathbb{E}[(\Gamma, \rho)|A, \Gamma_A] = \Gamma_A(\rho)$ and $\mathbb{E}[(\Gamma, \rho)|A, A', \Gamma_{A'}] = \Gamma_{A'}(\rho)$ almost surely. Now as Γ_A is harmonic in $D \setminus A$, we have that for any $z \in D \setminus A$ and any radially symmetric ρ_z of unit mass and with support inside $D \setminus A$, $\Gamma_A(z) = \Gamma_A(\rho_z)$. The claim now follows from Jensen's inequality for conditional expectations. □

After showing that any BTLS is contained in some CLE_4^M and checked that CLE_4^M satisfies indeed $(*)$, this lemma is used to show the union of any two BTLS is a again a BTLS.

The following lemma is very useful in our proof of the fact that any BTLS is contained in some CLE_4^M:

Lemma 9. *Let A and B are two BTLS coupled to the same GFF and suppose that almost surely, A satisfies condition $(*)$. Then, if almost surely, for all $z \notin A \cup B$, $|h_A(z)| \geq |h_{A\cup B}(z)|$, we have that almost surely $B \subseteq A$.*

Proof of Lemma 9: First, let us briefly explain why the conditions on A and B imply that $A \cup B$ is a thin local set. We know that $A \cup B$ is local. To show that $A \cup B$ is thin, we use the equivalent condition mentioned above. Indeed, note that $(\Gamma, f\mathbf{1}_{[A\cup B]_n})$ can be written as the sum of $(\Gamma, f\mathbf{1}_{[B]_n})$ and $(\Gamma, f\mathbf{1}_{[A]_n\setminus[B]_n})$. The first term converges to 0 thanks to the definition and the second one thanks to condition $(*)$. We refer to [28] for a more detailed discussion.

Now we know that $\Gamma = h_A + \Gamma^A = h_{A\cup B} + \Gamma^{A\cup B}$, and we know the conditional distribution of Γ^A (resp. $\Gamma^{A\cup B}$) given the σ-field $\mathcal{A}$ generated by (A, h_A) (resp. the σ-field $\mathcal{B} = \sigma(B, A, h_A, h_B, h_{A\cup B})$ – the fact that one can use this larger σ-field instead of $\sigma(A \cup B, h_{A\cup B})$ follows directly from the proof of the fact that $A \cup B$ is local). We also denote by A_+ (resp. A_-) the set of points in $D \setminus A$ where h_A is non-negative (resp. non-positive). Then, for any open set O,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[(\Gamma, \mathbf{1}_O)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{O\subset A_+\}}\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[(h_A(\mathbf{1}_O) + \Gamma^A(\mathbf{1}_O))^2 | \mathcal{A}\right] \mathbf{1}_{\{O\subset A_+\}}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(h_A(\mathbf{1}_O)^2 + \int_{O\times O} G_{D\setminus A}(x,y)dxdy\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{O\subset A_+\}}\right].\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by conditioning on $\mathcal{B}$, one gets that this same quantity is equal also to

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(h_{A\cup B}(\mathbf{1}_O)^2 + \int_{O\times O} G_{D\setminus(A\cup B)}(x,y)dxdy\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{O\subset A_+\}}\right].$$

But by definition, when $O \subset A_+$, $h_A(1_O) \geq |h_{A\cup B}(O)|$ (because $h_A(x) \geq |h_{A\cup B}(x)|$ for all $x \in A_+$). Hence, using the fact that $G_{D\setminus(A\cup B)} \leq G_{D\setminus A}$, we conclude that for every open set, almost surely on the event $O \subset A_+$, $G_{D\setminus(A\cup B)} = G_{D\setminus A}$ on $O \times O$. The same statement holds for A_- instead of A_+. Therefore $B \setminus A$ is polar in $D \setminus A$ and condition (3') allows us to conclude. □

3. GFF, level lines and absolute continuity

3.1. **SLE_4 background.** Let us first recall some well-known features of the Schramm-Sheffield coupling of SLE_4 with the GFF in the upper half-plane $\mathbb{H}$.

Consider the bounded harmonic function $F_0(z)$ in the upper-half plane with boundary values $-\lambda$ on $\mathbb{R}_-$ and $+\lambda$ on $\mathbb{R}_+$. Suppose that $(\eta(t), t \in [0, \tau))$ is a random simple curve defined in the closed upper half-plane, such that $\eta(0) = 0$, $\eta(0, \tau) \subset \mathbb{H}$ and the time τ is the (possibly infinite) smallest positive time t at which $\liminf_{s\to t-} d(\eta_s, \mathbb{R}) = 0$. Then, there exists a unique way to couple η with a GFF Γ in such a way that the following property holds (we state it in a somewhat strange way that will be easier to generalize):

> $(**)$**:** For all t, the set $\eta[0, \min(t, \tau)]$ is a BTLS of the GFF Γ, with harmonic function h_t defined as follows: $h_t + F_0$ is the unique bounded harmonic function in $\mathbb{H} \setminus \eta[0, \min(t, \tau)]$ with boundary values $-\lambda$ on the left-hand side of η, $+\lambda$ on the right side of η, and with the same boundary values as F_0 on $\mathbb{R}_-$ and $\mathbb{R}_+$.

Furthermore, this curve is then a SLE_4 (and $\tau = \infty$ almost surely), and when one couples SLE_4 with a GFF Γ in this way, then the SLE_4 process is in fact a measurable function of the GFF (see [5, 12, 26, 30, 33] for all these facts).

This statement can be generalized to more general harmonic functions F, which gives rise to $\mathrm{SLE}_4(\rho)$-type processes. See for instance [22].

3.2. **GFF absolute continuity.** Let $D = \mathbb{H} \setminus K$, where K is a countable union of closed discs such that in any compact set there are only finitely many of them. Consider a finite union S of closed dyadic squares in D with $I := \partial S \cap \mathbb{R} \neq \emptyset$, and a harmonic function H in D such that H

extends continuously to an open neighborhood I' of I in $\mathbb{R}$ in such a way that $H = 0$ on I' (we then say that the boundary value of H on I is zero).

Using absolute continuity properties of the GFF, it is not hard to see that the GFF Γ and $\Gamma + H$ are mutually absolutely continuous, when restricted to S (the proof of the following lemma can be found for example in [5, 30]):

Lemma 10. *Let Γ be a (zero boundary) GFF in D and denote its law restricted to S by $\mathbb{P}$. Let also $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ be the law of $\Gamma + H$, restricted to S. Then $\mathbb{P}$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ are mutually absolutely continuous with respect to each other. Moreover, the Radon-Nikodym derivative $d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}/d\mathbb{P}$ is a multiple of $\exp((\tilde{H}, \Gamma)_\nabla)$ where $\tilde{H}$ is the bounded harmonic function in $D \backslash \partial S$ that is equal to H on the boundary of S and to zero on the boundary of D.*

Furthermore, if D' is another domain as above, Γ' is a GFF in D' and $S \subseteq D \cap D'$ is at positive distance of $\partial D \triangle \partial D'$, then the laws of Γ and Γ' restricted to S are mutually absolutely continuous.

This absolute continuity property allows to change boundary conditions for local couplings away from the local sets:

Proposition 11. *Under the previous conditions, suppose that A is a BTLS for Γ an D-GFF such that $A \subset S \subset D$ almost surely. Define $\tilde{\mathbb{P}} := Z \exp((\tilde{H}, \Gamma)_\nabla) d\mathbb{P}$. Then A is coupled as a local set with $\tilde{\Gamma} := \Gamma - \tilde{H}$ (that is a $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ zero-boundary GFF). The corresponding harmonic function $\tilde{h}_A$ is equal to the unique bounded harmonic function on $D \setminus A$ such that $\tilde{h}_A + H - h_A$ goes to 0 on $\partial A \cup I$, and that $\tilde{h}_A$ goes to 0 on $\partial D \setminus I$.*

Proof. Notice that by the Cameron-Martin Theorem for the GFF (see Section 2), the law of Γ under $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ is that of $\tilde{\Gamma} + \tilde{H}$, where $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is a $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ GFF. Now we have to verify that with this change of variables A is still a local set. Note that conditioned to (A, h_A) we can write $\Gamma = h_A + \Gamma^A$, where Γ^A is a $\mathbb{P}$-GFF on $D \setminus A$. We have to show that under $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$, we can write $\Gamma^A = \tilde{\Gamma}^A + \tilde{H} + \tilde{h}_A - h_A$, where $\tilde{\Gamma}^A$ is a $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$-GFF on $D \setminus A$ and $\tilde{h}_A$ is the unique bounded harmonic function on $\mathbb{H} \setminus A$ such that $\tilde{h}_A + H - h_A$ goes to 0 on $\partial A \cup I$, and that $\tilde{h}_A$ goes to 0 on $\partial D \setminus I$. Let M be a measurable function of the field Γ^A, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[M(\Gamma^A) \mid A, h_A\right] &= Z_A \mathbb{E}\left[M(\Gamma^A) \exp\left((\tilde{H}, \Gamma)_\nabla\right) \mid A, \Gamma_A\right] \\
&= \bar{Z}_A \mathbb{E}\left[M(\Gamma^A) \exp\left((\tilde{H}, \Gamma^A)_\nabla\right) \mid A, \Gamma_A\right] \\
&= \bar{Z}_A \mathbb{E}\left[M(\Gamma^A) \exp\left((\tilde{H} + \tilde{h}_A - h_A, \Gamma^A)_\nabla\right) \mid A, \Gamma_A\right],
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we use that Γ^A is a GFF and that $\tilde{h}_A - h_A$ is harmonic in $D \setminus A$. But, we know that (under $\mathbb{P}$), conditionally on (A, Γ_A), Γ^A is just a GFF. Thus using again the Cameron-Martin Theorem and Lemma 6-(i), we can conclude. □

Corollary 12. *Let $D' \subseteq D$ be another domain with the same properties. Under the previous conditions, suppose that A is a BTLS for a GFF in D such that $A \subset S \subset D'$ almost surely. Then, there exist an absolutely continuous probability measure $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ under which A is coupled as a local set with a $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ zero-boundary GFF in D' and the corresponding harmonic function $\tilde{h}_A$ is equal to the unique bounded harmonic function in D' such that $\tilde{h}_A + H - h_A$ goes to 0 on $\partial A \cup I$, and that $\tilde{h}_A$ goes to 0 on $\overline{\partial} D' \setminus I$.*

Proof. It can be shown that A is a local set for $\Gamma^{D \setminus D'}$ such that its harmonic function $(h^{D \setminus D'})_A$ goes to 0 on $\overline{\partial} D \setminus I$ and $(h^{D \setminus D'})_A - h_A + h_K$ goes to 0 on $\partial A \cup I$ (see Lemma 3.9-1 of [26], or [33]). We conclude using the fact that $h_{D \setminus D'}$ is independent of $h^{D \setminus D'}$ and Proposition 11. □

3.3. **SLE/GFF absolute continuity.** Let D be as above and let H be a harmonic function on D with zero boundary conditions on some real neighbourhood I of the origin. Then we can define the generalized level line for the GFF in D with boundary conditions $F_0 + H$ up to the first time it hits the boundary:

Lemma 13 (Generalized level line)**.** *There exists a unique and measurable simple curve η coupled with the GFF in such a way that $(**)$ holds when one replaces F_0 by $F_0 + H$ and considers D instead of $\mathbb{H}$. We call η the generalized level line of $\Gamma + F_0 + H$ in D.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S}$ denote the collection of regions S such that S is a finite union of closed dyadic squares in D with $0 \in \partial S \cap \partial D \subset I$ and with S simply connected. Note that is enough to show that for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$ there is at most one curve satisfying $(**)$, when one replaces F_0 by $F_0 + H$, until the time it exits S. Indeed, suppose by contradiction that η_1 and η_2 are two different curves with this property and that with positive probability they do not agree. Thanks to Corollary 12, we can construct two local sets $\tilde{\eta}_1$ and $\tilde{\eta}_2$ coupled with the same GFF in a simply connected domain $D' \subseteq D$ such that when we apply ϕ, the conformal transformation from D' to $\mathbb{H}$, $(**)$ holds for $\phi(\tilde{\eta}_1)$ and $\phi(\tilde{\eta}_2)$ until the time they exit $\mathbb{H}$. The fact that they are different with positive probability contradicts the uniqueness of the Schramm-Sheffield coupling proved in citeDub,SchSh2.

It remains to show the existence of this curve. Take S_n an increasing sequence of elements in $\mathcal{S}$ such that their union is D. We can define η until the time it exits S_n, by using the Schramm-Sheffield coupling and Proposition 12. The above argument shows that they are compatible and so we can define η until the first time it touches ∂D. The measurability is just a consequence of the existence and uniqueness. □

In [22] Lemma 3.1, the authors show that a generalized level line in $\mathbb{H}$ corresponding to $F_0 + H_0$ with H_0 zero in a neighbourhood of the origin, $F_0 + H_0 \geq -\lambda$ on $(-c, 0)$ and $F_0 + H_0 \geq \lambda$ elsewhere cannot touch $\mathbb{R} \setminus [-c, 0]$ in finite time. Combined with our previous considerations, we extend this to:

Lemma 14 (Boundary hitting of generalized level lines)**.** *Let η be a generalized level line of $\Gamma + F_0 + H$ in D such that H is harmonic in D and has zero boundary values in a neighbourhood I of zero. Suppose $F_0 + H \geq \lambda$ in some neighbourhood J of $x \in \partial D$. Let τ denote the first time at which $\inf\{d(\eta_s, J), s < t\} = 0$. Then the probability that $\tau < \infty$ and that $\eta(t)$ converges to a point in J as $t \to \tau^-$ is equal to 0. This also holds if $F_0 + H \leq -\lambda$ in $(x - \epsilon, x + \epsilon)$ and more generally for any open neighbourhood of x on ∂D with similar conditions.*

Proof. Let S be a finite union of closed dyadic squares in the upper half-plane with $0 \in \partial S$, $x \in \partial S$, $\partial S \cap \partial D \subset I \cup J$ and $S \cap K = \emptyset$. From Lemma 13 we know that for any such S, a generalized level line η is measurable up to leaving S w.r.t. the GFF restricted to S. We first consider the case $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and suppose $x < 0$.

Define a harmonic function H_0 on $\mathbb{H}$ such that $H_0 = H$ on $(x - \epsilon, x + \epsilon)$, $H_0 = 0$ on $[x + \epsilon, \infty)$ and $H_0 = 2\lambda$ on $(-\infty, x - \epsilon]$. Then GFFs $\Gamma + F_0 + H_0$ and $\Gamma + F_0 + H$ restricted to S are absolutely continuous by Lemma 10. Also, both of these generalized level lines are measurable w.r.t. the GFF until they exit S. Now $F_0 + H_0$ satisfies the conditioned mentioned above and hence almost surely the generalized level line of $\Gamma + F_0 + H_0$ does not exit from S on $S \cap (x - \epsilon, x + \epsilon)$ in finite time. By absolute continuity and measurability of both generalized level lines, the result follows.

The case $x > 0$ is treated similarly. To treat the case where x is on the boundary of some component D_1 of K, notice that it suffices to consider S that do not surround D_1 and that for any such S we can connect D_1 to $\mathbb{R}$ using some curve γ such that $\mathbb{H} \setminus (D_1 \cup \gamma)$ is simply connected and contains S. The previous argument and Corollary 12 show that η cannot leave S through $S \cap J$ in finite time. □



FIGURE 2. Defining generalized level lines by absolute continuity.

4. A construction of CLE_4^M and its coupling with the GFF

In this section, we review the coupling of the GFF with the nested CLE_4 using Sheffield's SLE_4 exploration trees (i.e. the branching $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ process). As this section does not contain really new results, we try to be rather brief, and refer to [29, 33] for details. Note that we also provide an alternative construction of CLE_4 and its coupling to the GFF in Section 6.

4.1. **Radial symmetric $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$.** Let us first recall the definition of the radial (symmetric) $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ process targeted at 0 (for non-symmetric variants see [29]). It is the radial Loewner chain $(K_t)_{t\geq 0}$ in the unit disc, with driving function ξ_t defined as follows:

- Start with a standard real-valued Brownian motion $(B_t, t \geq 0)$ with $B_0 = 0$.
- Then, define the continuous process $U_t := \int_0^t \cot(B_s)ds$.
- Finally, set $W_t = 2B_t + U_t$ and $\xi_t := \exp(iW_t)$.

We set $D_t = \mathbb{D} \setminus K_t$, and denote by f_t to be the conformal maps from D_t onto $\mathbb{D}$ normalized at the origin.

Notice that as the integral $\int_0^t |\cot(B_s)|ds$ is almost surely infinite, the definition of U_t can not be viewed as an usual absolutely converging integral. Yet, one can for instance define first U_t^ϵ as the integral of $\mathbf{1}_{\{d(B_s,\pi\mathbb{Z})\geq\epsilon\}}\cot(B_s)$ and show that these approximating processes U_t^ϵ converge in L^2 to a continuous processes U_t. See e.g. [34] for a discussion of the chordal analogue.

We now describe some properties of the hulls generated by the radial $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$. For more details, see [29, 32, 34]:

(1) The process $O_t := \exp(iU_t)$ describes the evolution of the marked point in the $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ framework. In particular, SLE coordinate change considerations (see [4, 27]) show that during the time-intervals during which B_t is not in $\pi\mathbb{Z}$, the process behaves exactly like a chordal SLE_4 targeting the boundary prime end $f_t^{-1}(O_t)$ in the domain D_t.

(2) It is therefore clear that during the open time-intervals at which B is not in $\pi\mathbb{Z}$, the Loewner chain is generated by a simple continuous curve. These excursions of B away from $\pi\mathbb{Z}$ correspond to the intervals during which the $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ traces "quasi-loops": If (t_0, t_0') is an excursion interval away from $\pi\mathbb{Z}$, then $\gamma(t_0, t_0')$ is the image of a loop from ξ_{t_0} to itself in $\mathbb{D}$ via $f_{t_0}^{-1}$. When $B_{t_0} = B_{t_0'}$, then this quasi-loop does not surround the origin, when $B_{t_0'} = B_{t_0} \pm \pi$, it surrounds the origin clockwise or anti-clockwise. We stress that during the time-interval corresponding to excursions of B away from $\pi\mathbb{Z}$ the tip of the Loewner chain does not touch its past boundary and at the end of the excursion it accumulates at the prime end corresponding to the starting point.



FIGURE 3. Sketch of D_{t_0}, the stretch $\gamma(t_0, t]$. The harmonic measure from 0 of the "top part" of $\gamma[t_0, t]$ corresponds to B_t. This loop corresponds to an excursion away from $\pi\mathbb{Z}$ by each of B, B^z and $B^{z'}$. It corresponds to an increase of π for B and for B^z, but not for $B^{z'}$. The end-time of this loop is $\sigma(z, z')$.

(3) It is also possible to see (via the loop-soup construction of CLE_4, see [31]) that these quasi-loops are in fact proper loops (i.e. that $f_{t_0}^{-1}(\xi_{t_0})$ is a proper boundary point), but we do not, in fact, need this fact in the present paper. In fact, it can be shown that the whole $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ is *generated* by a two-dimensional curve, see [16].

For any other $z \in \mathbb{D}$, one can define the radial $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ from 1 to z in $\mathbb{D}$ to be the conformal image of the radial $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ targeting the origin, by the Moebius transformation of the unit disc that maps 0 to z, and 1 onto itself. This is now a Loewner chain growing towards z, and it is naturally parametrized using the log-conformal radius seen from z.

Moreover the radial $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ processes for different target points can be coupled together in a nice way. This target-invariance feature was first observed in [4, 27], and is closely related to the decompositions of $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ into SLE_4 "excursions" mentioned in (1). It says that for any z and z', the $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ targeting z and z' can be coupled in such a way that they coincide until the first time $\sigma(z, z')$ at which z' gets disconnected from z for the chain targeting z and evolve independently after that time. Note that in this coupling, the natural time-parametrizations of these two processes do not coincide. However, using the previous observation about the relation between the excursions of B and the intervals during which the $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ traces a simple curve, we see that up to time $\sigma(z, z')$ the excursion intervals away from $\pi\mathbb{Z}$ by the Brownian motions used to generate the $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ processes targeting z and z' correspond to each other. The time-change between the two Brownian motions can be calculated explicitly. For instance, if we define B_t^z to be the process obtained by time-changing the Brownian motion used in the construction that targets z via the log-conformal radius of D_t seen from 0 (instead of z), then as long as $t < \sigma(z, 0)$,

$$dB_t^z := 2\pi P^{f_t(z)} dB_t$$

where by P^z we denote the Poisson kernel in $\mathbb{D}$ seen from z and targeted at ξ_t (it follows from the Hadamard formula given below).

4.2. **$\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ branching tree and CLE_4.** The target-invariance property of $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ leads to the construction of the radial $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ branching-tree. We next summarize its definition and its main properties:

- For a given countable dense collection $\mathcal{Z}$ of points in $\mathbb{D}$, it is possible to define on the same probability space a collection of radial $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ processes in such a way that for any z and z', they coincide (modulo time-change) up to the first time at which z and z' get disconnected from each other, and behave independently thereafter.
- For any z consider the first time τ_z at which the underlying driving function driving function exits the interval $(-\pi, \pi)$ and define $O(z)$ to be the complement of K_t at that time containing z. Define $O(z')$ similarly. The previous property shows that $z' \in O(z)$ if and only if $z \in O(z')$.
- The CLE_4 carpet is then defined to be the complement of $\cup_{z\in\mathcal{Z}} O(z)$. In the sequel, we just write CLE_4 to denote this set (i.e. we call CLEs to be the random fractal sets, not the collection of loops).

Notice that from the construction, it is not obvious that the law of the obtained CLE_4 (and its nested versions) does not depend on the choice of the starting point (here 1) on $\partial\mathbb{D}$ (ie. of the root of the exploration tree). However, Propositions 1 and 2 provide one possible proof of the fact that this choice of starting point does not matter (this is also explained in [34], using the loop-soup construction of [31]). This justify a posteriori that when one iterates the CLE_4 in order to construct the nested versions, one does in fact not need to specify where to continue the exploration.

On the other hand, from this construction it is easy to estimate the expected area of the ϵ-neighborhood of CLE_4 and to see that the upper Minkowski dimension of CLE_4 is almost surely not greater than $15/8 = 2 - 1/8$. This follow from arguments in [27]: One wants to estimate the probability that $d(z, \mathrm{CLE}_4) < r$. By conformal invariance it is enough to treat the case where z is the origin in the unit dicc. But we can note that the conformal radius of D_t (in the $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$) is comparable to $d(0, \partial D_t)$ by Koebe's 1/4-Theorem, and that the log-conformal radius of $\mathbb{D} \setminus \mathrm{CLE}_4$ from the origin is just minus the exit time of $(-\pi, \pi)$ by the Brownian motion B which is a well-understood random variable (see [21] for instance). Hence, the asymptotic behavior as $r \to 0$ of the probability that $d(0, \mathrm{CLE}_4) < r$ can be estimated precisely.

One can also prove the somewhat stronger statement that the Hausdorff dimension CLE_4 is in fact equal to 15/8, by using second moment bounds (ie. bounds on the probability that two points z and z' are close to CLE_4), see [19].

The nested $\mathrm{CLE}_{4,m}$ and CLE_4^M can then be defined by appropriately iterating independent CLE_4 carpets in the respective domains $O(z)$ (starting the explorations in the nested domains at the point where one did just close the loops). The definition of CLE_4^M is almost word for word the same, just replacing $\tau(z)$ by $\tau_M(z)$ which is the first time at which the underlying Brownian motion B exits the interval $(-M\pi, M\pi)$. A similar argument then shows that the upper Minkowski dimension of CLE_4^M is not greater than $2 - (1/(8M^2))$ (the M^2 term is then just due to Brownian scaling – the exit time of $(-M\pi, M\pi)$ by Brownian motion is equal in distribution to M^2 times the exit time of $(-\pi, \pi)$).

4.3. **Coupling with the GFF.** To explain the coupling CLE_4 with the GFF, we can first describe the coupling of a single radial $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ process with a GFF. The whole coupling then follows iteratively from the strong Markov property and from the branching tree procedure. The proof of the coupling of the radial $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ follows the steps of the coupling of the usual SLE_4 with the GFF, as explained for instance in [26, 30]. It is based on the following observations:

(1) The Hadamard formula (see for instance [10]) gives the time-evolution of the Green's function under Loewner flow: for any two points x and y in $\mathbb{D}$, the Green's function $G_{D_t}(x, y)$ evolves

until $\min(\sigma(z,0),\sigma(w,0)$ according to

$$dG_{D_t}(z,w) = -2\pi P^{f_t(z)}P^{f_t(w)}dt,$$

where by P^z we denote the Poisson kernel in $\mathbb{D}$ seen from z and targeted at ξ_t as before.

(2) The cross-variation $d\langle B^z, B^w\rangle_t$ between the two local martingales B^z and B^w is equal to $4\pi^2 P^{f_t(z)}P^{f_t(w)}dt$, so that

$$dG_{D_t}(z,w) = -\frac{1}{2\pi}d\langle B^z, B^w\rangle_t.$$

(3) We can interpret $|B_t^z|/\pi$ (up to $\tau(z)$) as the harmonic measure in D_t seen from z, of the boundary arc between the tip of the curve and the force point U_t (the sign of B_t^z describes which of the two arcs one considers).

One can the first couple the GFF with the radial $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ up to the first time at which it surrounds the origin, exactly following the arguments of [30]. This defines a BTLS with harmonic function in $\{-2\lambda, 0, 2\lambda\}$. For those domains where the harmonic functions are zero, one can then continue the $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ iteration targeting another well-chosen point in that domain and proceed.

This radial construction is arguably also the easiest one to explain that in fact, conditionally on the CLE_4, the labels ϵ_j are i.i.d. This is then just a consequence of the time-reversal of SLE_4, so that changing the orientation of the quasi-loop that traces the boundary of O_j corresponds to a measure-preserving transformation of the driving Brownian motion (see for instance [34]). We come back to this in Paragraph 6.2.3.

5. Comparisons of BTLS with CLE_4^M

We now derive Proposition 3, Proposition 1 and Proposition 4. In some sense, this section is the core of the present paper.

Here D always denote a simply connected planar domain with non-empty boundary (so that the previous definition of CLE_4 makes sense).

5.1. **Proof of Proposition 3.** Let us fix a point z, and consider the radial $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ process targeted at z that is coupled with the field (and with the CLE_4^{M+1}) as described before. If $O(z) \not\subset O^{M+1}(z)$, then at some rational time (for the radial SLE's parametrization), this radial SLE is drawing some piece of $\partial O^{M+1}(z)$ within $O(z)$.

We therefore consider a fixed rational time q, and consider the event E_q that the radial $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ process targeting z, stopped at $\tau_{M+1}(z)$, has the following properties:

- It is tracing a loop.
- Its tip is in $O(z)$.
- Its boundary values are either $2\lambda M$ or $2\lambda(M+1)$

Let U denote the connected component of the complement of $O(z) \setminus K_q$ that has η_q on its boundary.

Then, conditionally on E_q, A and $(K_s, s \leq q)$, the evolution of η after q is that of a generalized level line in U that traces a $2\lambda M$ versus $2\lambda(M+1)$ interface for the GFF with boundary values depicted in Figure 4, until the first time at which this level-line hits the boundary of U again. From Lemma 14, it then follows that it can not exit U through some point of $(\partial O(z)) \setminus K_q$ because of the boundary values of the field there. Hence, the domain that this generalized level line after closing itself is almost surely included inside $O(z)$. In particular, if it happens that this domain contains z, then the connected component of the complement of $A \cup \mathrm{CLE}_4^{M+1}$ that contains z has $\partial O^{M+1}(z)$ as its outer boundary, and maybe some inner boundaries (that are part of $\partial O(z)$ – this can happen only if $O(z)$ is not simply connected). Importantly, the intersection of $\partial O^{M+1}(z)$ and $\partial O(z)$ is at most two points. As the maximum value of the ϵ-circle average of the GFF is of the order $\log(1/\epsilon)$,

these two intersection points cannot influence the value of the harmonic function (see [2] for the precise statement and proof) and thus, almost surely, the absolute value of the harmonic function corresponding to $A \cup \mathrm{CLE}_4^{M+1}$ is bounded by $2\lambda(M+1)$. A similar analysis can be applied to the case where $B_q \in (-2(M+1)\lambda, -2M\lambda)$.

Note that if for all rational q, the stopped radial $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ is either not in $O(z)$ or not in the process of tracing the loop that constitute the outer boundary of $O^{M+1}(z)$, then it means that $O(z) \subset O^{M+1}(z)$, so that in this case too, the harmonic function corresponding to $A \cup \mathrm{CLE}_4^{M+1}$ is necessarily bounded, in absolute value, by $2\lambda(M+1)$.

We can therefore conclude that $A \cup \mathrm{CLE}_4^{M+1}$ is also a $2\lambda(M+1)$-BTLS. But by Lemma 9 (recall that CLE_4^{M+1} satisfies $(*)$), this implies that $A \subseteq \mathrm{CLE}_4^{M+1}$ and proves Proposition 3.



FIGURE 4. Sketch of the proof: $\partial O(z)$ in plain; in dashed, the past of the radial exploration within $O(z)$. One discovers the dash-dotted interface as part of a loop along the radial $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ exploration: It cannot hit the dashed part without completing a CLE loop at that time or before that time because of the properties of $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$. And it cannot touch the parts of $\partial O(z)$ that are away from the dashed part before completing the loop, because the GFF boundary values are too small

5.2. **Proof of Proposition 1.** The proof of Proposition 1 follows along the same lines as that of Proposition 3. The difference lies in the fact that this time we are exploring one CLE_4^M using another CLE_4^M and thus the boundary conditions on $\partial O(z) \setminus K_q$ are exactly $\pm 2M\lambda$. As above, we conclude from Lemma 14 that the part of the radial $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ drawing $2\lambda(M-1)$ versus $2\lambda M$ level-line loop cannot exit $O(z)$ before completing that loop (one has to modify Figure 4, so that the dash-dotted interface η is now a $2M\lambda$ vs. $2(M-1)\lambda$ interface, and the continuous boundary data is $\pm 2M\lambda$).

Hence, it first follows as before that $|h_{A\cup \mathrm{CLE}_4^M}|$ has to be bounded by $2\lambda M$, and then using Lemma 9 that $A \subseteq \mathrm{CLE}_4^M$ almost surely. But this means that for all z,

$$|h_{A\cup \mathrm{CLE}_4^M(z)}| = 2\lambda M = |h_A(z)| \quad a.s.$$

Again, using Lemma 9 we see that $\mathrm{CLE}_4^M \subseteq A$ almost surely.

5.3. **Proof of Proposition 4.** Suppose now that A is a K-BTLS such that with positive probability, there exists a connected component of A that is disconnected from ∂D. We choose some M such that $2\lambda(M-1) \geq K$. We have just shown that almost surely, $A \subseteq \mathrm{CLE}_4^M$.

On the other hand, with positive probability, $D \setminus A$ contains an annular open region that disconnects this connected component of A from ∂D. Hence, there exists a deterministic such annular region O such that with positive probability, O is in $D \setminus A$ and disconnects a connected component of A from ∂D (we call this event $E = E_O$).

Given A and h_A, the conditional distribution of Γ^A is a GFF. It follow from Lemma 10 that on the event E_O, the conditional distribution of Γ^A restricted to O is mutually absolutely continuous with respect to the conditional distribution of Γ itself restricted to O. It is possible to show, using Corollary 12 and the fact that with positive probability the radial $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ makes a loop inside O, that with positive probability the CLE_4^M does not intersect the interior part of the complement of O. But this contradicts the fact that $A \subseteq \mathrm{CLE}_4^M$.

6. BTLS with two prescribed boundary values

In this section, we describe the class of BTLS such that the harmonic function can only take two prescribed possible values. In particular, we construct a collection of BTLS that are smaller than CLE_4 and determine for which values such BTLSs exist.

Some aspects of the following discussion are strongly related to the $\kappa = 4$ case of boundary conformal loop ensembles (and their nesting) introduced and studied in [16] (that was written up in parallel to the present paper) for general κ.

6.1. **A first example.** Let us first describe in some detail one specific example. Consider a GFF in the unit disc and fix two boundary points, say $-i$ and i. Consider the zero-level line of this GFF. This is an $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-1;-1)$ from $-i$ to i that is coupled with the GFF as a BTLS [12]. It is known that this is a simple path η from $-i$ to i in the closed disc, and it is easy to see that its Minkowski dimension is almost surely smaller than some $d < 2$. Moreover, it is also known that the $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-1;-1)$ is a deterministic function of the GFF [12].

The harmonic function h_η associated to this curve is described as follows: $\mathbb{D} \setminus \eta$ is the union of countably many connected components $(D_j^1)_{j\in J}$, and a component lies either to the right or to the left of the curve (if one views the curve as going from $-i$ to i). In each component D_j^1, the harmonic function has boundary conditions 0 on $\partial D_j^1 \cap \partial\mathbb{D}$ and on $\partial D_j^1 \cap \eta$, the boundary condition is λ or $-\lambda$ depending on whether D_j^1 is on the left or on the right of η.

As inside each component D_j^1 have independent GFF-s with boundary conditions, we can iterate: Suppose for example that the D_j^1 lies to the right of η, then, ∂D_j^1 is divided into to arcs, one of which is an excursion of η away from the ∂D, and the other one is a counter-clockwise arc from x_j to y_j of ∂D. We now define a $\mathrm{SLE}_4(0;-1)$ process from x_j to y_j. This is again a simple curve, and can be coupled with the GFF with boundary conditions h_A in D_j^1 in such a way that the boundary conditions on its left are $-\lambda$ and on its right are λ. We proceed in a symmetric way in the connected components that lie above η. In this way, we obtain a new BTLS (by first sampling η, and then one $\mathrm{SLE}_4(0;-1)$ process in each D_j^1), and harmonic functions defined via the boundary conditions as indicated in Figure 5.

The iteration then further proceeds by defining $\mathrm{SLE}_4(0;-1)$ processes in each of the remaining connected components which have part of ∂D on their boundary. One then defines a second layer of loops and one proceeds iteratively. We then consider the closure $A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$ of the union of all the traced level lines.

Clearly, after any finite number of iterations in the previous construction, one has a λ-BTLS, and therefore a subset of the CLE_4^2 by our previous results. Hence, A is itself a subset of the CLE_4^2 and therefore a BTLS. It is also easy to see that a given point $z \in D$ is almost surely contained in a loop cut out after finitely many iterations, so that the harmonic function associated to A takes its values in $\{-\lambda, \lambda\}$.



FIGURE 5. First iterations: The $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-1;-1)$ and its boundary conditions on the left. The $\mathrm{SLE}_4(0;-1)$ in the second layer on the right picture that creates loops with $\pm\lambda$ boundary conditions.

We can make the following observations about this set $A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$:

- As opposed to the CLE_4, the set $A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$ is fairly skinny. Indeed, it is just made out of the union of all SLE_4 type of paths. For instance, each excursion of η away from $\partial\mathbb{D}$ is on the boundary between two connected components of $A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$ (one $+\lambda$ loop to its right and one $-\lambda$ loop to its left). This indicates that the Minkowski dimension of $A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$ should be $3/2$ (we will come back to this later).
- The set $A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$ is the only BTLS with boundary values in $\{-\lambda,\lambda\}$. In fact, suppose that $\tilde{A}$ is another BTLS coupled with the same GFF as $A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$, such that $h_{\tilde{A}}$ takes its values in $\{-\lambda,\lambda\}$ and such that conditionally on Γ, $A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$ and $\tilde{A}$ are independent. Then, one can loosely follow the strategy of the proof of Proposition 1 to conclude that $\tilde{A} = A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$ almost surely. More precisely, consider again some $z \notin \tilde{A}$ and denote by $O(z)$ the component of z in $D \setminus \tilde{A}$. Now, notice that almost surely no level line in the construction of the component of z in $D \setminus A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$ can make an excursion inside of $O(z)$: Indeed, consider for contradiction the first level line in the construction that enters $O(z)$. Then one the one hand this level line cannot exit $O(z)$ on the boundary of $\tilde{A}$. On the other hand it is also almost surely a simple path. Thus, it cannot exit $O(z)$ at all and we obtain a contradiction. As this holds for a countable dense family of z, we can again conclude from Lemma 9 that $A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$ is the

only λ-BTLS with these properties. In particular its law does not depend on the arbitrary choice of the points x and y in the previous layered construction.

Furthermore, we note that, similarly to the construction of CLE_4^M, we can iterate the construction of the set $A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$ to construct a BTLS with harmonic function that takes its values in $\{-2\lambda, 2\lambda\}$: indeed, we pick a countable number of dense $z \in D$ and iterate the construction in the component containing z until the boundary values are in $\{-2\lambda, 2\lambda\}$. At each step in the construction, one has a $2\lambda-$BTLS, and therefore in the limit, one still has a BTLS contained in CLE_4^2. But from Proposition 1 it now follows that the obtained set is exactly the CLE_4. This therefore provides an alternative construction of CLE_4 (and of its iterated nested versions $\mathrm{CLE}_{4,m}$ and CLE_4^M) that builds only on the coupling of the chordal $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-1;-1)$ and $\mathrm{SLE}_4(0;-1)$ process with the GFF. Notice that in this case the measurability of the CLE_4 just follows from that of the respective $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-1;-1)$ and $\mathrm{SLE}_4(0;-1)$ processes plus general properties of the local set and level lines.

As we point out in Section 6.3, there is also a direct way to see that this set $A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$ and its iterates are thin (without using the relation to CLE_4^M as we just did). Hence, we indeed obtain a stand-alone construction of CLE_4 and of its properties. Interestingly, we cannot show that this construction gives the same law as CLE_4 without using the coupling with the GFF.

6.2. **General sets $A_{-a,b}$ and proof of Proposition 2.** We first describe for any $-a \leq 0 \leq b$ with $b + a \geq 2\lambda$, the construction of a BTLS $A_{-a,b}$ such that the corresponding harmonic function takes its values in $\{-a, b\}$. This generalizes our previous constructions of $A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$ and CLE_4^M, that corresponds to $A_{-2M\lambda,2M\lambda}$. We then prove that there are no such BTLS when $b + a < 2\lambda$ (unless a or b are equal to 0, in which case one can take the empty set), and discuss the labels assigning to each component of $D \setminus A_{-a,b}$ its expected value.

6.2.1. *Construction of $A_{-a;b}$.*

- $a = 0$ *or* $b = 0$*:* We set $A_{-a,b} = \emptyset$ and the corresponding harmonic function takes the value 0 everywhere.
- $a = -n_1\lambda$ *and* $b = n_2\lambda$*, where* n_1 *and* n_2 *are positive integers:* We can just suitably iterate independent copies of the previous set $A_{\lambda,-\lambda}$. We choose a countable dense set of $z \in D$ and iterate in the component containing z as long as the boundary values are in $\{-n_1\lambda, n_2\lambda\}$.
- $a + b = 2\lambda$*:* Set $c := (b - a)/2 \in (-\lambda, \lambda)$ and repeat exactly the same construction as above, except that one now traces c-level lines ie. $c-\lambda$ vs $c+\lambda$ interfaces iteratively instead of $-\lambda$ vs. λ interfaces. Exactly the same construction and the same arguments lead to the construction of a BTLS $A_{c-\lambda,c+\lambda}$ such that the corresponding harmonic function takes its values in $\{c - \lambda, c + \lambda\}$. These sets are called the boundary conformal loop ensembles for $\kappa = 4$ in [16]. Notice that in these sets each interior boundary arc is shared by two components of the complement.
- $a + b = n\lambda$ *where* $n \geq 3$ *is an integer*: Define $c \in (-\lambda, \lambda)$ such that there exists two non-negative integers n_1, n_2 with $a = c - n_1\lambda$ and $b = c + n_2\lambda$. Starting from $A_{c-\lambda,c+\lambda}$ we now iterate copies of $A_{-(n_1-1)\lambda,n_2\lambda}$ (resp. of $A_{-n_1\lambda,(n_2-1)\lambda}$) in the connected components of the complement of $A_{c-\lambda,c+\lambda}$ depending on the value of the harmonic function.
- *General case with* $b + a > 2\lambda$: by symmetry, we can suppose that $a > \lambda$. Define $c \in [0, \lambda)$ and $n_1, n_2 \geq 0$ such that $b = c + n_1\lambda$ and $b - n_2\lambda \in [-a, -a + \lambda)$. Note that $b - n_2\lambda < 0$ and that $n_2 \geq 2$. Now consider a sample of $A_{b-n_2\lambda,b}$. In the connected components where the harmonic function is b, we stop. In those components where the harmonic function is $b - n_2\lambda$, we iterate copies of $A_{-d,-d+n_2\lambda}$ where $d = (a + b) - n_2\lambda \in [0, \lambda)$. In this way, we obtain on the one hand connected components where the harmonic function is $-a$ (and we stop), and on the other hand, components where the harmonic function is $b - d$. In the latter, we iterate independent copies of $A_{d-n_2\lambda,d}$, and we continue in this way. At each step

of the iteration, one has a BTLS that is contained in a given CLE_4^M for a fixed M. If we continue the iteration around every point z until the iteration stops, we define a BTLS $A_{-a,b}$ such that the corresponding harmonic function takes values in $\{-a, b\}$.

Conformal invariance of the GFF implies the conformal invariance of $A_{-a,b}$ and thus we see that $\mathbb{P}(h_{A_{-a,b}}(z) = -a)$ does not depend on $z \in D$. Using the fact that $\mathbb{E}((\Gamma, 1)) = 0$, we therefore see that for all $z \in D$,

$$\mathbb{P}(h_{A_{-a,b}}(z) = -a) = \frac{b}{a+b} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(h_{A_{-a,b}}(z) = b) = \frac{a}{a+b},$$

as one might have expected.

To see that $A_{-a,b}$ are the unique BTLS B with $h_B \in \{-a, b\}$, one can adapt the arguments that we used in the last subsection in the case where $a = b = \lambda$. Thus, in order to complete the proof of part (2) of Proposition 2, it remains to explain the monotonicity statement:

Suppose $[-a, b] \subset [-a', b']$ and $-a < 0 < b$ with $b + a > 2\lambda$. Starting with $A_{-a,b}$, and then sampling independent copies $A_{a-a',a+b'}$ in all the connected components of its complement where the GFF-boundary values are a and independent copies of $A_{-a'-b,b'-b}$ in the others, we obtain a BTLS with boundary values in $\{-a', b'\}$. By uniqueness it follows that the obtained set is indeed $A_{-a',b'}$ and by construction it contains $A_{-a,b}$.

6.2.2. *There are no two-valued BTLS $A_{-a,b}$ with $a + b < 2\lambda$.* Let us now explain the proof of Proposition 2-(1): First, one can discard the case where $-a$ and b have the same sign because the mean value of the field has to remain 0. When $-a < 0 < b$ and $b+a < 2\lambda$, suppose for contradiction that $A_{-a,b}$ exists. Sample $A_{-a-b,-a-b+2\lambda}$ in those connected components of the complement of $A_{-a,b}$ to see that $A_{-a,b} \subset A_{-a,-a+2\lambda}$ where the harmonic function is equal to b. In particular, note that a connected component of $D \setminus A$ where the corresponding harmonic function $h_{A_{-a,b}}$ is $-a$ remains a connected component of $D \setminus A_{-a,-a+2\lambda}$. Such a connected component has boundary value $-a$, but has no boundary arc that is shared with a component of $D \setminus A_{-a,-a+2\lambda}$ where the harmonic function is $-a + 2\lambda$. This leads to a contradiction with an observation made above: we know from the construction of $A_{-a,-a+2\lambda}$ that all interior boundary arcs are shared by two components of the complement.

6.2.3. *Labels of $A_{-a,b}$.* We conclude this subsection with a small discussion about signs of the harmonic functions assigned to each (O_j) of CLE_4. As mentioned in Section 4, by combining the radial $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ construction and the reversibility of SLE_4 one can show that it is possible to first sample the family (O_j), and then the labels ϵ_j using independent fair coins. The idea is that one can define the symmetric radial $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2)$ using a Poisson point process of SLE_4 bubbles, which is invariant under resampling of the orientations of the bubbles, see e.g. [34]).

This conditional independence between the heights in different domains feature is specific to CLE_4. For instance, for CLE_4^M the existence of a correlation between the heights in different domains is clear from the construction. For $A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$, the situation is actually quite reversed: conditioned on $A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$, one fair coin toss that decides the sign of the harmonic function at the origin is enough to determine the harmonic function in all the other connected components of the complement of $A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$. This follows from the fact that any two neighbouring components have different heights. In the case of $A_{c-\lambda,c+\lambda}$ for $c \neq 0$, one does not even need to toss a coin, as the asymmetry (and conformal invariance) makes it in fact possible to detect almost surely the sign of the harmonic function at the origin. From this point of view, it is even quite intriguing that by iterating $A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$, one obtains a CLE_4 where the signs of the heights are independent in the different components.

6.3. **Dimension of $A_{-a,b}$.** The goal of the present paragraph is to derive the following fact:

Proposition 15. *For each given z, the random variable* $\log(\mathrm{crad}(z,\mathbb{D})) - \log(\mathrm{crad}(z,\mathbb{D}\setminus A_{-a,b}))$ *is distributed like a constant times the exit time from* $(-a\pi/(2\lambda), b\pi/(2\lambda))$ *by a one-dimensional Brownian motion* B *started from* 0.

In particular, for each given z, the probability that $d(z, A_{-a,b}) < r$ is (up to constants) comparable to r^s for $s = s_{-a,b} := \lambda^2/(2(b+a)^2)$ as $r \to 0$.

Proof. Let us first focus on the case of the set $A = A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$. Fix a point $z \in \mathbb{D}$ and note that the construction of the set A is obtained via a continuously increasing family of sets $(A_t, t \geq 0)$ that correspond to the concatenation of the various chordal $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-1;1)$ and $\mathrm{SLE}_4(0;-1)$ processes that one iterates. All these sets A_t are clearly local sets, and the value of the corresponding harmonic function $h_t(z)$ at z is always in $[-\lambda,\lambda]$ (as its boundary values are in $\{0,\lambda,-\lambda\}$). Furthermore, by definition it is a local martingale, and therefore a martingale. We know that it converges to either $+\lambda$ or $-\lambda$ as $t \to \infty$.

On the other hand, we know (see eg. [12]) that when R_t is a continuously increasing family of local sets then $h_{R_t}(z)$ evolves like a constant times Brownian motion when parametrized by the decrease of the log-conformal radius of $\mathbb{D}\setminus R_t$ seen from z. This therefore implies that $\log(\mathrm{crad}(z,\mathbb{D})) - \log(\mathrm{crad}(z,\mathbb{D}\setminus A))$ is distributed like a constant times the exit time of $(-\pi,\pi)$ by a one-dimensional Brownian motion.

Exactly the same argument can be applied to all $A_{-a,b}$'s that we have constructed – one just needs to note that in our iterative procedure, all the iterations are independent and the harmonic functions h_t always remain in $[-a,b]$. □

Note that this argument can be used to see that $A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$ is indeed a BTLS with upper Minkowski dimension almost surely not larger than $3/2$ and that CLE_4 obtained by iterations of $A_{-\lambda,\lambda}$ is indeed a BTLS (as it satisfies (3)).

Acknowledgements. This work was supported by the SNF grant #155922. The authors are part of the NCCR Swissmap. The authors would like to thank the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Cambridge, as well as the Clay foundation, for hospitality and support during the program *Random Geometry* where a part of this work was undertaken.

References

[1] J. Aru. The geometry of the Gaussian free field combined with SLE processes and the KPZ relation, PhD thesis, 2015

[2] J. Aru, A. Sepúlveda. Survey in preparation.

[3] J. Aru, A. Sepúlveda, W. Werner. On imaginary BTLS of the GFF, in preparation

[4] J. Dubédat. Commutation relations for Schramm-Loewner evolutions. Communication in Pure and Applied Mathematics 60, 1792–1847, 2007.

[5] J. Dubédat. SLE and the free field: partition functions and couplings. Journal of the American Mathematical Society 22, 995–1054, 2009.

[6] B. Duplantier and S. Sheffield. Liouville quantum gravity and KPZ. Inventiones Mathematicae 185, 333–393, 2011.

[7] H. Föllmer, Calcul d'Itô sans Probabilités. Sém. Probabilités Strasbourg XV, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 850, Springer, 143-150, 1981.

[8] J.B. Garnett and D.E. Marshall. Harmonic Measure Cambridge University Press, 2005,

[9] Z.-X. He, O. Schramm. Fixed points, Koebe uniformization and circle packings, Annals of Mathematics 137, 369-406, 1995.

[10] K. Izyurov and K. Kytola. Hadamard's formula and couplings of SLEs with free field. Probability Theory Related Fields 155, 35–69, 2013.

[11] J.P. Miller and S. Sheffield. The GFF and CLE(4), slides of 2011 talks and private communications.

[12] J.P. Miller and S. Sheffield. Imaginary Geometry I. Interacting SLEs, Probability Theory and related Fields, to appear.

[13] J.P. Miller and S. Sheffield. Imaginary Geometry II. Reversibility of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho_1;\rho_2)$ for $\kappa \in (0,4)$, Annals of Probability, to appear.

[14] J.P. Miller and S. Sheffield. Imaginary Geometry III. Reversibility of SLE_κ for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$, Annals of Mathematics, to appear.
[15] J.P. Miller and S. Sheffield. Imaginary Geometry IV: interior rays, whole-plane reversibility, and space-filling trees, preprint
[16] J.P. Miller, S. Sheffield and W. Werner. CLE percolations, preprint 2016.
[17] J.P. Miller, S.S. Watson and D.B. Wilson. Extreme nesting in the conformal loop ensemble, Annals of Probability, to appear.
[18] J. Miller, H. Wu. Intersections of SLE paths: the double and cut point dimension of SLE, Probability Theory and related Fields, to appear.
[19] Ş. Nacu and W. Werner. Random soups, carpets and fractal dimensions. Journal of the London Mathematical Society 83, 789–809, 2011.
[20] E. Nelson. Construction of quantum fields from Markoff fields, Journal of Functional Analysis 12, 97-112, 1973.
[21] S.C. Port and C.J. Stone, Brownian motion and classical potential theory, *Academic Press*, 1978.
[22] E. Powell and H. Wu Level lines of the Gaussian Free Field with general boundary data , preprint
[23] Yu. A. Rozanov. Markov Random Fields. *Springer-Verlag* 1982.
[24] M. Yor and D. Revuz. Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion. *Springer-Verlag* 1999.
[25] O. Schramm. Scaling limits of loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees. Israel Journal of Mathematics 118, 221–288, 2000.
[26] O. Schramm and S. Sheffield. A contour line of the continuum Gaussian free field. Probability Theory Related Fields 157, 47–80, 2013.
[27] O. Schramm, S. Sheffield, and D. B. Wilson. Conformal radii for conformal loop ensembles. Communications in Mathematical Physics 288, 43–53, 2009.
[28] A. Sepúlveda. On thin local sets of the GFF, preprint, 2016.
[29] S. Sheffield. Exploration trees and conformal loop ensembles. Duke Mathematical Journal 147, 79–129, 2009.
[30] S. Sheffield. Conformal weldings of random surfaces: SLE and the quantum gravity zipper, Annals of Probability, to appear.
[31] S. Sheffield and W. Werner. Conformal Loop Ensembles: The Markovian characterization and the loop-soup construction. Annals of Mathematics 176, 1827–1917, 2012.
[32] W. Werner. Some recent aspects of random conformally invariant systems. Ecole d'été de physique des Houches LXXXIII, 57–99, 2006.
[33] W. Werner. Topics on the GFF and CLE(4), Lecture Notes, 2016.
[34] W. Werner and H. Wu. On conformally invariant CLE explorations. Communications in Mathematical Physics 320, 637–661, 2013.

Department of Mathematics, ETH Zürich, Rämistr. 101, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland
E-mail address: juhan.aru@math.ethz.ch
E-mail address: leonardo.sepulveda@math.ethz.ch
E-mail address: wendelin.werner@math.ethz.ch